UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/827,484	04/19/2004	Makarand Gore	200315586-1	3315	•
	7590 10/26/200 CKARD COMPANY	77	EXAM	INER	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			KISHORE, GOLLAMUDI S		
	AL PROPERTY ADM NS, CO 80527-2400	IINISTRATION	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	•
	,	•	1615		
					_
	·		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/827,484	GORE, MAKARAND
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph.D	1615
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
Period for Reply		VITUAL OF THETWARD DAVID
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state that the period for reply will, by state that the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
•—	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matters	s, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims .		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-59</u> is/are pending in the application	on.	•
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.		·
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-59</u> are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyance	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	ection is required if the drawing(s)	is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in App	olication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pe	riority documents have been re	ceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bure	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ist of the certified copies not re	ceived.
,		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		rmal Patent Application

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-20 and 55-56 are, drawn to jettable solutions containing vesicles, classified in class 424, subclass 450.
 - II. Claims 21-41 are, drawn to a method of forming a jettable pharmaceutical solution, classified in class 264, subclass 4.1.
 - III. Claims 42-48 are, drawn to a method of forming an oral pharmaceutical, classified in class 424, subclass 439.
 - IV. Claims 49-54 and 57-59 are, drawn to a system for dispensing an oral solution, classified in class 426, subclass 302.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process can be used to make a cosmetic encapsulated within the vesicles or the product can be formed from already formed liposomes and loading the pharmaceutical by an ion or pH gradient.
- 3. Inventions I and IV are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediatefinal product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the

Art Unit: 1615

intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as such without edible material for topical and other modes of administration and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

- Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be formed using different types of ink jet dispensers applicants themselves are claiming.
- 5. Inventions II and III are independent and distinct in that they are different methods.
- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 1615

- 8. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:
- 10. In Groups I and II: a) vesicles formed from lipids; b) vesicles formed from diblock polymers.
- 11. The species are independent or distinct because they are different types of vesicles.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 21 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after

Art Unit: 1615

the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

- 12. In Group I: a) species in claim 16; b) species in claim 17; c) species in claim 18; d) species in claim 19; species in claim 20.
- 13. The species are independent or distinct because they are different types of vesicles.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

Effective November 1, 2007, if applicant wishes to present more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims in an application, applicant will be required to file an examination support document (ESD) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 before the first Office action on the merits (hereafter "5/25 claim threshold"). See Changes to Practice for Continued Examination Filings, Patent Applications Containing Patentably Indistinct Claims, and Examination of Claims

Art Unit: 1615

in Patent Applications, 72 Fed. Reg. 46715 (Aug. 21, 2007), 1322 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 76 (Sept. 11, 2007) (final rule). The changes to 37 CFR 1.75(b) apply to any pending applications in which a first Office action on the merits (FAOM) has not been mailed before November 1, 2007. Withdrawn claims will not be taken into account in determining whether an application exceeds the 5/25 claim threshold. For more information on the final rule, please see http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/presentation/clmcontfinalrule.html.

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in this Office action, applicant is required to file an election responsive to the restriction requirement. Applicant may not file a suggested restriction requirement (SRR) in lieu of an election responsive to the restriction requirement as a reply. A SRR alone will not be considered a *bona-fide* reply to this Office action.

If applicant elects an invention that is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims, applicant will not be required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims. If the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims, applicant may file an amendment canceling a number of elected claims so that the elected invention would be drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims.

If the restriction requirement is mailed <u>on or after</u> November 1, 2007, applicant is also required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 that covers each of the elected claims, unless the elected invention is drawn to no more than 5 independent claims and no more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims. To avoid the abandonment of the application, the ESD (if required) and the election must be filed within **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this Office action. The two-month time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136.

If the restriction requirement is mailed <u>before</u> November 1, 2007, the election must be filed within **ONE MONTH** or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this Office action. The time period for reply is extendable under 37 CFR 1.136. Furthermore, if the elected invention is drawn to more than 5 independent claims or more than 25 total claims taking into account any amendment to the claims, the Office will notify applicant and provide a time period in which applicant is required to file an ESD in compliance with 37 CFR 1.265 covering each of the elected claims or amend the application to contain no more than 5 independent elected claims and no more than 25 total elected claims.

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gollamudi S. Kishore, Ph.D whose telephone number is

(571) 272-0598. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM- 4 PM, alternate

Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Woodward Michael can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gollamudi S Kishore, Ph.D

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1615

GSK